

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 21, 2003. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicants amend Claims 1, 7, 8, 15, 19, 20, 25, and 26. Applicants cancel Claims 2, 3, 10, 16, 17, 21, and 22 without disclaimer or waiver. Applicants add Claims 27-54, which are fully support by the Application as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Examiner Interview

Applicants' attorney, Mr. Todd A. Cason (Reg. No. 54,020), conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Miller on November 12, 2003. Applicants submit this summary of the telephonic interview to record Applicants' understanding of the substance of the interview. If Applicants' understanding is inaccurate, notice of such is appreciated.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy and opportunity to conduct the telephonic interview. During the interview, the Examiner and attorneys for Applicants discussed the Examiner's rejections of Applicants' claims and the Examiner's interpretation of Applicants' claim language. Although the Examiner and Attorney for Applicants reached no firm conclusions or agreements regarding the claims, the Examiner and Attorney for Applicants discussed claim elements that Attorney for Applicants believes to be missing from the cited references as discussed below.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-11 and 13-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,487,424 issued to Kraft et al. ("Kraft"). Applicants amend Claim 1 to include all elements of Claim 3 which the Examiner and Attorney for Applicants discussed during the telephone interview.

As amended, Claim 1 recites:

A method for providing selectable characters within a user interface comprising:

determining an operating mode of a communication device;

receiving an input associated with a selected key;

determining a group of characters associated with the selected key based on the operating mode;

displaying a first character of the group of characters associated with the selected key within a first portion of the user interface;

displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface;

highlighting the first character displayed within the second portion of the user interface;

receiving a second input associated with the selected key;

highlighting the second character within the group of characters associated with the selected key in response to the second input; and

displaying the second character within the first portion of the user interface.

As Attorney for the Applicants noted during the phone interview, the portions of Kraft cited by the Examiner do not disclose "receiving an input associated with a selected key" and "receiving a second input associated with the selected key." The cited portions of Kraft disclose use of alphanumeric keypad 7. Col. 14, ll. 65-67; Col. 14, ll. 1-4 and 7-12. To the extent that pressing a key in alphanumeric

keypad 7 can be described as "receiving an input associated with a selected key", *Kraft* fails to disclose "receiving a second input associated with the selected key." *Kraft* discloses all subsequent entries to the mobile device being made using scroll key 41, and thus, mobile device does not "receiv[e] a second input associated with the selected key" as recited by amended Claim 1. As a result, *Kraft* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of amended Claim 1. Claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1.

Although Claims 8, 15, and 20 differ in scope from Claim 1, Claims 8, 15, and 20 include elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, are missing from *Kraft*. Claims 8, 15, and 20 are allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 8, 15, and 20 and their respective dependents.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraft* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,683 issued to Wells et al. ("Wells"). Although of differing scope from Claim 1, Claim 12 includes elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, are missing from *Kraft*.

Combination with *Wells* fails to remedy these omissions. The teachings of *Wells* are limited to an animation sequence the display of which varies with user input. *Wells* does not disclose the elements missing from *Kraft*, as discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Thus, Claim 12 depends from allowable Claim 1, and Claim 12 is allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 12.

New Claims

Applicants add new Claims 27-49, which are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. New Claim 27 includes all elements of original Claim 4 which the Examiner and Attorney for Applicants also discussed during the telephone interview.

New Claim 27 recites:

A method for providing selectable characters within a user interface comprising:

determining an operating mode of a communication device;

receiving a first input associated with a selected key;

determining a group of characters associated with the selected key based on the operating mode;

displaying a first character of the group of characters associated with the selected key within a first portion of the user interface;

displaying a cursor within the first portion of the user interface, the cursor positioned centrally relative to a second portion of the user interface and highlighting the first character; and

horizontally displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface.

As Attorney for the Applicants noted during the phone interview, the portions of *Kraft* cited by the Examiner in rejecting original Claim 4 do not disclose "displaying a cursor within the first portion of the user interface, the cursor positioned centrally relative to a second portion of the user interface" or "horizontally displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key proximal to the first character within a second portion of the user interface." In fact, as Figure 3 of *Kraft* clearly indicates, to whatever extent the device of *Kraft* display[s] characters associated with a selected key, these characters are displayed vertically. Furthermore, Figure 3 also clearly indicates, e.g. in the third and fourth frames of Figure 3, that cursor

23 is not "positioned centrally relative to a second portion of the user interface[.]" As a result, *Kraft* does not disclose "[a] cursor positioned centrally relative to [the] second portion of the user interface" or "horizontally displaying the group of characters." Thus, *Kraft* does not anticipate every element of new Claim 27. Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claim 27 and its dependents.

Although of differing scope from Claim 27, Claims 31, 36, and 37 include elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 27, are absent from *Kraft*. Thus, *Kraft* does not anticipate every element of Claims 31, 36, and 37. Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 31, 36, and 37 and their respective dependents.

New Claim 41 includes elements of original Claim 7 which the Examiner and Attorney for Applicants also discussed during the telephone interview.

New Claim 41 recites:

A method for providing selectable characters within a user interface comprising:
determining an operating mode of a communication device;
receiving a first input associated with a selected key;
determining a group of characters associated with the selected key based on the operating mode; and
displaying the group of characters associated with the selected key within a user interface;
receiving a second input associated with the selected key;
determining a time interval between receiving the first input and receiving the second input; and
calculating a time-out period based on the time interval.

As Attorney for the Applicants noted during the phone interview, the portions of *Kraft* cited by the Examiner in rejecting original Claim 7 do not disclose "determining a time interval between receiving the first input and receiving the second input" and "calculating a time-out period based on the time interval." The portions of *Kraft* cited by the Examiner states only that "[a] character is added to a text string after a certain period with no pressings, time-out, or after the activation of another key." Col. 8, ll. 15-35. The cited portions do not discuss "determining a time interval between receiving the first input and receiving the second input" or "calculating a time-out period" as recited by Claim 41. Thus, *Kraft* does not anticipate every element of new Claim 41. Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claim 41 and its dependents.

Although of differing scope from Claim 41, Claims 44, 48, and 49 include elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 41, are absent from *Kraft*. Thus, *Kraft* does not disclose every element of Claims 44, 48, and 49. Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 44, 48, and 49 and their respective dependents.

Conclusions

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

A check in the amount of \$926.00 to cover the fee for additional claims and a check in the amount of \$180.00 to cover the fee required for filing an Information Disclosure Statement after the mailing date of a Final Office Action are enclosed. No other fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTs L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Barton E. Showalter
Reg. No. 38,302

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6509

Date: Dec. 16, 2003

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number:

05073